



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,968	01/26/2001	Katsushi Sato	450100-02952	5245

20999 7590 07/23/2004

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

BONSHOCK, DENNIS G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/769,968

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

Dennis G. Bonshock

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2173

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment A as received on 11-17-2003.
2. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

3. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba et al., Patent # 6,392,669, hereinafter Matoba and Pietropaolo et al., Patent # 6,351,765, hereinafter Pietropaolo.
4. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Protheroe et al., Patent # 6,414,686, hereinafter Protheroe.
5. Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Crow et al., Patent # 6,538,665, hereinafter Crow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2173

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba et al., Patent # 6,392,669, hereinafter Matoba and Pietropaolo et al., Patent # 6,351,765, hereinafter Pietropaolo.

7. With regard to claims 1, 7, and 13, Matoba teaches a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium (see column 2, line 41), that combines a reservation subject icon (see column 3, line 41), and a means for recording the start time of a piece of media (see column 3, line 28). Matoba however doesn't teach a time based display area, where in when an icon is moved into the display area, the display area displays the corresponding time division, and a selection means for receiving input media for the arbitrary reservation subject, and input media having at least one component, said selection means operating to select and mix formats of the at least one component of the media. Pietropaolo teaches a media editing system similar to that of Matoba, but also teaches the use of a time based display area (see column 11, line 55), the functionality of being able to move icons into this display area (see figure 9 and column 11, line 52), a receiving of input media from the reservation subject, the input having at least one component (video) (see column 1, lines 5-12, and column 2, lines 4-10), and the system receiving media of different formats (see column 1, lines 5-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Matoba and Pietropaolo before him at the time the invention was made to modify the schedule management system of Matoba to include the time based display and the functionality of dragging icons into the display area, the interface for receiving media

Art Unit: 2173

components, possibly of different formats of Pietropaolo. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because the use of a time based display for importing icons provides the user with a simple means to import media in one of a plurality formats where they can keep track of when the specific media will be played.

8. With regard to claims 2, 8, and 14, Matoba further teaches the said recorded media being program executable (see column 7, line 30).

9. With regard to claims 3, 9, and 15, Matoba further teaches the detection of the first end, corresponding to a program starting time and the second end, corresponding to a program ending time (see figure 1 and column 3, line 28), and reservation being preformed based on these values (see column 3, line 35).

10. With regard to claim 19, which teaches the at least one component being an audio component, Pietropaolo teaches, in column 2, lines 4-10, the media editor being an video and/or audio editor.

11. With regard to claim 20, which teaches the at least one component being an video component, Pietropaolo teaches, in column 2, lines 4-10, the media editor being an video and/or audio editor.

12. With regard to claim 21, which teaches the formats of the at least one component includes an analog format, Pietropaolo teaches, in column 1, lines 5-12, the system receiving both analog and digital video.

13. With regard to claim 22, which teaches the formats of the at least one component includes an digital format, Pietropaolo teaches, in column 1, lines 5-12, the system receiving both analog and digital video.

Art Unit: 2173

14. With regard to claim 23, which teaches the formats of the at least one component includes an optical format, Pietropaolo teaches, in column 1, lines 5-12, the system receiving both analog and digital video, which could obviously have come from a optical source.

15. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Protheroe et al., Patent # 6,414,686, hereinafter Protheroe. Matoba and Pietropaolo teach the schedule management system as rejected above in claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15. They however fail to teach the ability to move whole reservations around on the display screen, or to move one end of a reservation (clipping). Protheroe teaches a multimedia editing system similar to that of Matoba and Pietropaolo, but further teaches the ability to move whole reservations around on the display screen (see column 6, line 40), and she also teaches the process of clipping (see column 6, line 43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Protheroe before him at the time the invention was made to modify the scheduling management system of Matoba and Pietropaolo to include the said editing functionality of Protheroe. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because importing and exporting a piece of media anytime you need to change it's location or properties would be superfluous.

16. Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Crow et al., Patent # 6,538,665, hereinafter Crow. Matoba and Pietropaolo teach the schedule management

Art Unit: 2173

system as rejected above in claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15. They however fail to teach the ability to drag media into a trash bin for deletion. Crow teaches a media presentation scheme similar to that of Matoba and Pietropaolo, but further teaches the ability to drag pieces of media into a trash bin (see column 9, line 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Crow before him at the time the invention was made to modify the schedule management system of Matoba and Pietropaolo to include the trash removal system of Crow. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this form of deleting items has become a standard interface in most operating systems today.

Response to Arguments

17. The arguments filed on 5-12-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.

18. The applicants' argue that the prior art references individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a "selection means for receiving input media for said arbitrary reservation subject, said input media having at least one component said selection means operating to select and mix formats of said at least one component of said media."

19. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that Pietropaolo does teach a receiving of input media form the reservation subject, the input having at least one component (video) (see column 1, lines 5-12, and column 2, lines 4-10), and the system receiving media of different formats (see column 1, lines 5-12).

Art Unit: 2173

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach a means of scheduling media for a given date and time in the future.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (703) 305-4668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/769,968

Page 8

Art Unit: 2173

dgb



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173